REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. In this amendment, claim 25 has been amended without prejudice to address a minor informality. Thirty-five claims, claims 10, 11, 18, 38, 60, 41-59 and 61-71, have been canceled. Claims 4, 5 and 24 remain unchanged by this amendment. Claims 72-87 have been added. Hence, claims 4, 5, 24, 25 and 72-87 are presented for examination upon entry of this amendment. Applicant submits that no new subject matter has been added by these amendments.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his time, careful consideration, and the comments and suggestions for advancing the case provided during the March 22, 2005 telephone interview. The Applicant agrees with the summary of the interview provided by the Examiner mailed on March 23, 2005. Consistent with the agreement reached during the interview, the Applicant, as indicated below, has elected one set of claims for continued prosecution at this time.

ELECTION/RESTRICTIONS

The Examiner has required restriction to one of four purportedly distinct claim groups under 35 U.S.C. § 121. The Applicant hereby elects, without traverse, to prosecute in this application the invention represented by Claim Group I which includes claims 4, 5, 24, and 25. Consequently, the Applicant has submitted herein a proposed amendment to cancel, without prejudice, those of the claims associated with the invention of Claim Groups II-IV, i.e., claims 10, 11, 18, 38, 60, 41-59, and 61-71. Furthermore, Applicant reserves the right to continue prosecution of one or more of the canceled claims in one or more divisional applications.

Page 11 of 16

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Final Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 18, 24, 25, 38, and 41-71 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,154,465 of Pickett et al. (hereafter "**Pickett**") in view of Resource Reservation Protocol, RFC2205 of Braden et al. (hereafter "**Braden**"). The undersigned respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of Pickett and Braden. However, for the sake of expediting issuance of the case, the Applicant has cancelled claims except claims in Group I, claims 4, 5, 24, and 25. Importantly, the cancellation of these claims should not be taken as an admission that the Examiner's rejection has merit. As such, the Applicant reserves the right to pursue claims of similar breadth in one or more continuing applications. At this point the Applicant points out several distinctions between the claimed subject matter and the teachings of Pickett and Braden.

As presently understood by the undersigned, Pickett relates to systems and methods for transmitting and receiving voice and data in multiple modes, and more particularly to systems and methods for multiple native mode voice and data transmissions and receptions with a communications system having a multi-bus structure. (Pickett Col. 1, Lines 10-14) The undersigned agrees with the Examiner's comment on Page 3 of the Office action that Pickett does not explicitly disclose the capability of serving as reservation aggregation points. In addition, the undersigned believes Pickett does not teach or reasonably suggest at least the following: (1) the use of a media aggregation manager as a reservation protocol session proxy; (2) establishing a device that provides application/protocol specific multiplexing/de-multiplexing of media traffic onto a pre-allocated reservation protocol session; (3) mechanisms for the interactive exploration of changes in path selection that might affect link utilization; (4) substantially simultaneously provisioning a plurality of routers that are part of a selected path; and (5) mechanisms for the interactive illustrations of path prioritization.

As presently understood by the undersigned, Braden teaches an example of a particular bandwidth reservation protocol, the Resource Reservation Protocol (RSVP). RSVP is an Internet Protocol- (IP) based protocol that allows applications running on end-stations, such as desktop computers, to communicate per-flow requirements by signaling the network. Using RSVP, the

initiator of a VoIP call transmits a Path message downstream to the prospective recipient. The Path message causes state information, such as information regarding the reverse path to the initiator, to be stored in each node along the way. Subsequently, the prospective recipient of the VoIP call initiates resource reservation setup by communicating its requirements to an adjacent router via an upstream Resv message. For example, the prospective recipient may communicate a desired quality of service (QoS), e.g., peak/average bandwidth and delay bounds, and a description of the data flow to all intervening routers between the call participants. Additionally, after the reservation has been established, participating routers must continue to exchange periodic status and control messages to maintain the reservation. Consequently, processing and storage overhead associated with reservation establishment and maintenance increases linearly as a function of the number of calls. The undersigned finds no teaching or suggestion in Braden regarding at least the following: (1) the use of a media aggregation manager as a reservation protocol session proxy; (2) establishing a device that provides application/protocol specific multiplexing/de-multiplexing of media traffic onto a pre-allocated reservation protocol session; (3) mechanisms for the interactive exploration of changes in path selection that might affect link utilization; (4) substantially simultaneously provisioning a plurality of routers that are part of a selected path; and (5) mechanisms for the interactive illustrations of path prioritization.

With this brief overview of Pickett and Braden, the undersigned now submits the following arguments point out significant differences between the invention as claimed by the Applicant and the combination of Pickett and Braden.

Regarding claims 4 and 24, neither Pickett nor Braden teach or reasonably suggest "displaying a first projected link utilization schedule in response to a first request to analyze the effect of conveying media packets between the first user community and the second user community and the second user community over a first path of the plurality of physical paths, the first projected link utilization schedule illustrating predicted bandwidth usage for routers associated with the second path." The Examiner, on page 3 of the Office action, suggests this is taught by Pickett by quoting a portion of Pickett indicating "the D-type signaling channel may have sufficient bandwidth to provide signaling information for a plurality of communication

links, with communications systems implemented and/or connected together as described herein, a common D-type signaling channel my be used to efficient provide signaling information for a plurality of T-1 or similar links coupled to a plurality of such communications systems, etc."

However, Pickett at column 44, line 15-21 states: "D channel used to carry, for example, control signal signals and customer call data such as in a packet switched mode. As is known in the art, a D or similar control signaling channel typically is used to provide appropriate signaling information for the voice or B channels. The D channel typically and preferably carries such control signaling information in the from of a serial data stream." Pickett does not suggest displaying the information. More specifically, Pickett does not teach or suggest the ability to display projected link utilization schedules responsive to requests to analyze the effect of conveying media packets between the first user community and the second user community over a selected path of a plurality of physical paths through which media packets maybe exchanged between the first user community and the second user community. Pickett also does not address the concept of a projected link utilization schedule illustrating predicted bandwidth usage for routers associated with the selected path.

The Examiner continues on Page 3 by suggesting that the "displaying of graphical representation of a first and second media aggregation manager" is taught by Pickett's Trace manager. Pickett [0250] indicates "a complete log of all system activity, the trace manager provides useful information such as real-time call progress, WAN protocol traces, frame relay management information, and voice mail activity to facilitate troubleshooting." Pickett continues at [0254] by stating "the trace manager includes the following features and benefits: Display of all system activity; graphically based; enabled on a per-service basis; multiple trace levels; and events and color-coded for readability." The undersigned respectfully suggests the Examiner is not giving meaning to the defined phrase "media aggregation manager." On page 12, line 5 of the present application, a "media aggregation manager" is explicitly defined as "a network device, such as an edge device at the ingress/egress of a user community, or a group of one or more software processes running on a network device that provides application/protocol specific multiplexing/de-multiplexing of media traffic onto a pre-allocated reservation protocol

session." <u>Pickett's</u> trace manager cannot be equated with a media aggregation manager as defined.

The undersigned agrees with the Examiner's statement on Page 3 of the Office action that Picket does not explicitly disclose the capability of serving as reservation session aggregation points on behalf of a first user community and a second user community, respectively, the first user community and the second community communicatively couple by a plurality of physical paths through which media packets may be exchanged by the way of one or more packet forwarding devices. The Examiner suggests that the combination of <u>Pickett</u> with <u>Braden</u> would not only teach this idea but would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. <u>Braden</u>, however, does not teach that RSVP should be used in a single instance to support a plurality of application sessions among terminals of multiple user communities by multiplexing the application sessions onto the single RSVP session. For at least these reasons, claims 4 and 24 are clearly distinguishable over the combination of <u>Pickett</u> and <u>Braden</u>.

With regard to claims 5 and 25, the combination of <u>Pickett</u> does not teach or reasonably suggest the overlaying of a selected path of the plurality of physical paths onto existing bandwidth allocations to determine projected link utilization associated with the selected path. <u>Pickett</u> only refers to a visual representation of whether particular ports or resources are in use. [0272] This does not teach the visual representation of projected link utilization as claimed. In addition, <u>Pickett</u> does not teach or suggest the overlaying of a selected path from the plurality of physical paths that connect the communities. For at least this additional reason, claims 5 and 25 are further distinguishable over <u>Pickett</u> and <u>Braden</u>.

<u>NEW CLAIMS</u>

By this amendment, Sixteen new claims, claims 72-87, have been added to claim additional novel aspects of the present invention and/or round out the depth of the claim coverage. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 72-87 are allowable over the prior art. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by the addition of the new claims.

PATENT

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment and remark have overcome the rejections, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance be issued for claims 4, 5, 24, 25 and 72-87.

REQUEST FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at **(303) 607-3633**.

CHARGE OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

No fee is believed to be necessary for entry of this paper. In the event that any such fee is necessary for the entry of this paper, please charge to our Deposit Account No. **06-0029** any fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17 which may be requested to enter this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: **35657**

Date: **May 5, 2005**

By: _____
Michael A. DeSanctis, Esq.
Atty. Reg. No.:   39,957
Telephone: (303) 607-3633

DNVR1:60300848.01